

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 19, 2006. Claims 1, 8-11, 21, 22, 24, 28, 34-38, 40, 41, 43-46 and 48 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 24 and 28 are in independent form. Claims 2, 20, 34, 39, 42 and 47 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 21, 24, 28, 34-38, 40-41 and 48 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

Claims 1, 8-11, 21, 22, 24, 28, 35-38, 40, 41, 43-46, 48 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,081,852 (Baker).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 24 and 28 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a data communication system including a source node adapted to transfer object data, one or more destination nodes adapted to receive the object data transferred from said source node, and a controller adapted to set a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes. The source node is adapted (a) to obtain connection information indicating the logical connection from the controller, (b) to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of a respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, (c) to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and (d) to transfer packets including data in the one or more

segment and the connection information from the source node to one or more destination nodes via a serial bus .

Among other notable features of Claim 1 is a controller adapted to set a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes, wherein the source node is adapted (a) to obtain connection information indicating the logical connection from the controller, (b) to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of a respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, (c) to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and (d) to transfer packets including data in the one or more segment and the connection information from the source node to said one or more destination nodes via a serial bus.

Baker relates to a method and system for autonomously operating a PCI-serial bus interface device circuit of a packetized data communications interface device. The Baker system discusses an IEEE 1394 network through which a PC 12 is connected to peripheral devices 14. The Baker system uses a threshold (“high water mark”) to control the start of a transmission (column 18, lines 46-48; column 17, lines 60-63), and divides a packet of data into portions of different sizes and assigns those portions to different destination addresses (Column 22, lines 15-20).

The Office Action cites column 4 lines 25-40, column 10 lines 55-56 and column 22, lines 15-20, as disclosing the source node and controller of Claim 1. Applicants disagree. The cited passages merely discuss, among other things, operation of a PC 12, which is performed in connection with a PCI interface of the PC 12. Column 22, lines 15-20 discusses dividing a packet of data into portions of different sizes and assigning those portions to different

destinations, as discussed above. However, Applicants have found nothing in Baker that would teach or suggest “a controller adapted to set a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes, wherein said source node is adapted (a) to obtain connection information indicating the logical connection from said controller, (b) to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of a respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, (c) to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and (d) to transfer packets including data in the one or more segment and the connection information from said source node to said one or more destination nodes via a serial bus,” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants’ opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 24 and 28 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and, therefore, are also believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/

Jennifer A. Reda

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 623335v1